

Applic. No. 10/694,613
Amdt. dated September 25, 2006
Reply to Office action of July 28, 2006

Drawing Amendments

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figs. 1 and 2. These sheets, which include Figs. 1 and 2, replaces the original sheets including Figs. 1 and 2. Fig. 1 was relabeled as Fig. 2 and Fig. 2 was relabeled as Fig. 1. Furthermore, the reference symbol "14" has been added to the figure now designated as Fig. 2.

Please approve the drawing changes that are marked in red on the accompanying "Annotated Sheets Showing Changes" of Figs. 1 and 2. Formal "Replacement Sheets" of amended Figs. 1 and 2 are also enclosed.

Attachments: Replacement Sheets

Annotated Sheets Showing Changes

Applic. No. 10/694,613
Amdt. dated September 25, 2006
Reply to Office action of July 28, 2006

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1, 2, 6-9, 11, and 12 remain in the application.

Claims 1 has been amended. Claims 3-5 and 10 were previously cancelled. The drawings have been amended to correct clerical errors.

In the second paragraph on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claims 1, 2, 6, and 12 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by Spiegel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,011,125) (hereinafter "Spiegel") under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

It is respectfully believed that since claim 12 has been indicated as being allowed, the listing of claim 12 in the above-noted rejection is an oversight by the Examiner.

The rejection has been noted and the claims have been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. The claims are patentable for the reasons set forth below. Support for the changes is found on page 12, lines 11-12, page 15, lines 14-15, page 12, line 6 and page 16, line 4 as well as Fig. 2 of the specification.

Moreover, the fact that the mechanism guides the after-gripper bar along the after-gripper path is disclosed on page 16, lines 3-4, where it is disclosed that the mechanism guides the element 24.3 along this path. It is disclosed on page 16, lines 11-12 that the after-gripper bar is attached to the element 24.3. Accordingly it necessarily follows that the after-gripper bar of the mechanism is guided along the path. Furthermore, it is disclosed on page 12, line 12 that the mechanism guides the after-gripper bar, whereby it is must follow that this occurs along the after gripper path. Therefore, no new matter has been added.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 1 calls for, *inter alia*:

a mechanism guiding the after-gripper bar together with the after-grippers along the closed after-gripper path.

It is noted that the corporate assignee of the Spiegel reference is also the assignee of the instant application. Therefore, applicants are very familiar with the Spiegel reference.

The Spiegel reference discloses a sucker (28), which reads on the after-gripper of the present invention. Spiegel discloses that the sucker (28) is moved along a closed path by a mechanism, where the closed path is elliptical (column 2, lines 16-20 and column 5, lines 49-50).

Spiegel discloses a shaft (11), which reads on the after-gripper bar of the present invention. This is because the suction element (7) with the sucker (28) is attached to the shaft (11) (column 4, lines 44-46 and Fig. 2, symbols 7, 11, and 28). Spiegel discloses that the shaft (11) is attached to a slide (9) by a joint (17d) (column 4, lines 44-46 in connection with column 4, lines 60-62 and Fig. 2, symbols 7, 11, and 28).

It necessarily follows that Spiegel discloses a back and forth movement of the shaft (11) around the joint (17d). This movement is not a movement of the shaft (11) along a closed path. Spiegel discloses that the elliptical closed path movement of the suction opening of the suckers (28), disclosed on column 5, lines 49-50, results from the interaction of the back and forth movement of the shaft (11) with the sucker (28) and the entering and exiting movement of the sucker (28) (column 5, lines 34-37 and lines 47-49). Accordingly, the

Applic. No. 10/694,613
Amdt. dated September 25, 2006
Reply to Office action of July 28, 2006

shaft (11) of Spiegel, which reads on the after gripper bar of the present invention, does not move along a closed movement path.

As seen from the above-given remarks, the reference does not show a mechanism guiding the after-gripper bar together with the after-grippers along the closed after-gripper path, as recited in claim 1 of the instant application. The Spiegel reference discloses that the shaft has a back and forth movement. Spiegel does not disclose that the shaft moves with after-grippers on along a closed after-gripper path. This is contrary to the invention of the instant application as claimed, in which a mechanism guides the after-gripper bar together with the after-grippers along the closed after-gripper path.

Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable, dependent claims 2 and 6-9 are believed to be allowable as well.

In the third paragraph on page 3 of the Office action, claims 7 has been rejected as being obvious over Spiegel (U.S. Patent No. 5,011,125) in view of Blaser (U.S. Patent No. 5,011,125) under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Blaser does not make up for the deficiencies of Spiegel. Since claim 1 is believed to be

Applic. No. 10/694,613
Amdt. dated September 25, 2006
Reply to Office action of July 28, 2006

allowable, dependent claim 7 is believed to be allowable as well.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 1. Claim 1 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 2, and 6-9 are solicited.

It is appreciatively noted from page 4 of the Office action that claims 11 and 12 are allowed.


In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Applic. No. 10/694,613
Amdt. dated September 26, 2006
Reply to Office action of July 28, 2006

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect
to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner
Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,



For Applicant(s)

Alfred K. Dassler
52,794

AKD:cgm

September 26, 2006

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101

(1/8)

FIG. 1

